

your education, whether his preparation has been approved by the Council on Pharmacy and Chemistry of the A. M. A., and if so, just ask to see some documentary evidence of that fact; lying is easy and cheap. For instance, the Dios Chemical Co., advertises (or did) that its nostrums have been approved by the Council on Pharmacy and Chemistry—or implies as much. As a matter of fact, they have *not* been so approved, and doubtless would not be “in a thousand years!”

Apropos of the foregoing, we cannot resist a few words of comment anent a concern quite recently “sprung” upon us. Detail  
**A TYPICAL** men have been visiting various  
**EXAMPLE.** parts of the state leaving with physicians a beautifully printed pamphlet, entitled, in letters of gold, “The Balance Wheel of Life Metabolism.” If we dip into this scientific monograph—we should be grateful to the philanthropic “manufacturers,” the American Apothecaries Co., for placing so many pearls of wisdom in our hands without price—we will soon realize what fools we have been all the years of our life. We learn that “Elimination is aided by ‘salvitæ’”; that “Salvitæ dissolves tenacious mucoid secretions which often adhere to the alimentary canal”; that “It meets the pressing need of the majority of patients who consult a physician at his office.” Just think of that. All that such a majority of your patients need, is one remedy—“salvitæ”! And all these years you have been ignorant of how to really care for your patients! Studying this valuable treatise more carefully, we learn that “salvitæ” is specially suited to the “uric acid diathesis”: and also “specially indicated in cases of constipation with debility”; that it is a “genuine tonic laxative”; that it relieves or cures—generally cures—myalgia, neuralgia, constipation, Bright’s disease. “It invigorates the cells it cleanses,” “it preserves the life of cells.” “Salvitæ prevents premature fossilization of the individual,” for which the Lord be praised! Here have we been living a life of fear, dreading our approaching fossilization and not knowing that the philosopher’s stone had been found! What is this wonderful life saver and anti-fossilization agent, “salvitæ”? Merely a shot-gun effervescent saline cathartic!

#### “OUR CENSORIOUS CONTEMPORARIES.”

Under this alliterative title our esteemed contemporary, the *New York Medical Journal* (incorporating several other once decent medical publications, now alas! all managed by the same advertising agency) chooses to class us together with the *Journal of the American Medical Association*, the *CALIFORNIA STATE JOURNAL OF MEDICINE*, the *Pennsylvania Medical Journal*, and the *Maryland Medical Journal*. At any rate we are not ashamed of being in such company. Had we been classe<sup>d</sup> with some other publications, that could be mentioned, we should not have been especially thankful. As to the imputation of “censor-

iousness,” we are inclined to be thankful for that too. Certainly, if our esteemed contemporary is so anxious to be advertised that he is thankful for being held up to the scorn of good men for his attitude in regard to the advertisement of nostrums, we might be thankful to be advertised as opposed to such a course. Tillotson said that: “Censoriousness and sinister interpretation of things, \* \* \* render the conversation of men grievous and uneasy.” It seems that we have helped to render our esteemed contemporary quite uneasy. Albeit very thankful. His peculiar attitude reminds us of an old story of a hunting party who had passed a rule that the first man who was “censorious” with regard to the cooking would have to do the cooking himself. The cook for his part was “tired of his job,” and, as no one was willing to relieve him, began putting on the table the most unsavory mixtures; which, however, were received with unflinching commendation. At last he skilfully abstracted the center of the yolk of an egg and supplied its place with red pepper. The egg, of course, appeared as though nothing had happened to it. When it was bitten into, however, the biter jumped up into the air with a loud exclamation, that we need not quote verbatim, adding, nevertheless, as soon as he could recover his breath, “But I like it, I like it very much.”

So our contemporary “likes” our gentle criticisms and as he watches his advertising pages grow, makes the condemnatory remark about the profession, at least about that portion of it that is disposed to be honest and decent, that the late Mr. Vanderbilt once made about the public.

He reminds us of a juggler who is trying to keep five or six balls in the air at once, while he balances a sword on the end of his nose and sings Annie Laurie. He says himself in an editorial, under the title, “Mysticism in Medical Practice,” immediately preceding the one which has called forth these remarks, “There are patients who will not endure verbal jugglery on the part of a physician,” from which it is plain that he believes that the best of the laity have both more sense and more honesty than the profession. While he assumes to be the moral, intellectual and professional guide, philosopher and friend of all doctors whatsoever, his hands are red with the blood of decent medical journalism, which he is doing his best to murder. In an editorial in his issue of January 27, 1906, he inquires whether the doctor is an “easy mark” and states that “business men commonly regard the doctor as little more than an amiable fool where the investment of money is concerned.” Is not subscription to a medical journal an investment of money?

Could it be possible that the advertising agency that controls our esteemed contemporary is composed of business men?

The doctor may be an “amiable fool,” decency in medical journalism may be dead and calling nostrums, quacks and fakirs by their right names may be “censorious.” We believe, however, that there is something to be gained beside the approval of our own consciences by standing up for decency and common sense in the conduct of medical journals. If our neighbor really is thankful for our criticisms of his methods we will take care that he has much to be thankful for.—*Journal of the Med. Soc. of New Jersey.*

#### PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION.

##### Second Publication.

‘To amend Article X by adding after the second sentence the following:

The fiscal year of the Society shall be from January 1st to December 31st. The number of members in good standing in each component society on the first day of January of each year shall be taken as the basis for the assessment for that fiscal year, as fixed by the House of Delegates.